

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

EXPRESS MAIL NO. EV327878988US

Applicant : Michael Thomas Greene
Application No. : n/a
Filed : September 26, 2003
Title : ROUTING OF INTERCONNECTED REGIONS
Grp./Div. : n/a
Examiner : n/a
Docket No. : 51249/RAG/Z74

**LETTER FORWARDING CERTIFIED
PRIORITY DOCUMENT**


Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PostOffice Box 7068
Pasadena, CA 91109-7068
September 26, 2003

Commissioner:

Enclosed is a certified copy of United Kingdom patent Application No. 0222528.2, which was filed on September 27, 2002, the priority of which is claimed in the above-identified application.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Robert A. Green
Reg. No. 28,301
626/795-9900

RAG/rlm
Enclosure: Certified copy of patent application
RLM PAS528557.1-*09/26/03 11:43 AM



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

The Patent Office
Concept House
Cardiff Road
Newport
South Wales
NP10 8QQ

I, the undersigned, being an officer duly authorised in accordance with Section 74(1) and (4) of the Deregulation & Contracting Out Act 1994, to sign and issue certificates on behalf of the Comptroller-General, hereby certify that annexed hereto is a true copy of the documents as originally filed in connection with the patent application identified therein.

In accordance with the Patents (Companies Re-registration) Rules 1982, if a company named in this certificate and any accompanying documents has re-registered under the Companies Act 1980 with the same name as that with which it was registered immediately before re-registration save for the substitution as, or inclusion as, the last part of the name of the words "public limited company" or their equivalents in Welsh, references to the name of the company in this certificate and any accompanying documents shall be treated as references to the name with which it is so re-registered.


In accordance with the rules, the words "public limited company" may be replaced by p.l.c., plc, P.L.C. or PLC.

Re-registration under the Companies Act does not constitute a new legal entity but merely subjects the company to certain additional company law rules.

Signed

Dated

10 September 2003



Request for grant of a patent

(See the notes on the back of this form. You can also get an explanatory leaflet from the Patent Office to help you fill in this form)

The Patent Office

Cardiff Road
Newport
South Wales

28SEP02 E751727-1 D01974
P01/7700 0.00-022528.2

1. Your reference

MJN/67950/000

2. Patent application number

(The Patent Office will fill in this part)

0222528.2

3. Full name, address and postcode of the or of each applicant (underline all surnames)

Zuken Ltd.
1500 Aztec West
Almondsbury
Bristol BS32 4RF
United Kingdom (GB)

Patents ADP number (if you know it)

If the applicant is a corporate body, give the country/state of its incorporation

United Kingdom (GB)

8472870001

4. Title of the invention

ROUTING OF INTERCONNECTED REGIONS

5. Name of your agent (if you have one)

"Address for service" in the United Kingdom to which all correspondence should be sent (including the postcode)

PAGE HARGRAVE
Southgate, Whitefriars
Lewins Mead
BRISTOL BS1 2NT

Patents ADP number (if you know it)

05996483001

6. If you are declaring priority from one or more earlier patent applications, give the country and the date of filing of the or of each of these earlier applications and (if you know it) the or each application number

Country	Priority application number (if you know it)	Date of filing (day / month / year)
---------	---	--

7. If this application is divided or otherwise derived from an earlier UK application, give the number and the filing date of the earlier application

Number of earlier application	Date of filing (day / month / year)
-------------------------------	--

8. Is a statement of inventorship and of right to grant of a patent required in support of this request? (Answer 'Yes' if:

Yes

- a) any applicant named in part 3 is not an inventor, or
 - b) there is an inventor who is not named as an applicant, or
 - c) any named applicant is a corporate body.
- See note (d))

Patents Form 1/77

9. Enter the number of sheets for any of the following items you are filing with this form. Do not count copies of the same document

Continuation sheets of this form	-
Description	7
Claim(s)	2
Abstract	1
Drawing(s)	3

10. If you are also filing any of the following, state how many against each item.

Priority documents	-
Translations of priority documents	- /
Statement of inventorship and right to grant of a patent (Patents Form 7/77)	Two /
Request for preliminary examination and search (Patents Form 9/77)	One
Request for substantive examination (Patents Form 10/77)	-
Any other documents (please specify)	-

11. I/We request the grant of a patent on the basis of this application.

Signature

PAGE HARGRAVE

Date 26/09/02

12. Name and daytime telephone number of person to contact in the United Kingdom
- Mr M J Newstead (0117) 927 6634

Warning

After an application for a patent has been filed, the Comptroller of the Patent Office will consider whether publication or communication of the invention should be prohibited or restricted under Section 22 of the Patents Act 1977. You will be informed if it is necessary to prohibit or restrict your invention in this way. Furthermore, if you live in the United Kingdom, Section 23 of the Patents Act 1977 stops you from applying for a patent abroad without first getting written permission from the Patent Office unless an application has been filed at least 6 weeks beforehand in the United Kingdom for a patent for the same invention and either no direction prohibiting publication or communication has been given, or any such direction has been revoked.

Notes

- If you need help to fill in this form or you have any questions, please contact the Patent Office on 0645 500505.*
- Write your answers in capital letters using black ink or you may type them.*
- If there is not enough space for all the relevant details on any part of this form, please continue on a separate sheet of paper and write "see continuation sheet" in the relevant part(s). Any continuation sheet should be attached to this form.*
- If you have answered 'Yes' Patents Form 7/77 will need to be filed.*
- Once you have filled in the form you must remember to sign and date it.*
- For details of the fee and ways to pay please contact the Patent Office.*

ROUTING OF INTERCONNECTED REGIONS

The present invention relates to the routing of interconnected regions, such as the tracks of electrical circuits within integrated circuits, multi-chip modules, circuit boards or systems.

Various computer programs (so-called "routers") are known for the routing of tracks of electrical circuits. These are so-called "serial" routers. In such routing, a "connection" indicates which regions of the circuit must be connected together. A serial router considers each requested connection separately and realises it into conductive track segments before moving on to the next connection. There are many cases where a standard serial router will never find the routing solution that an experienced human router might find. Consider the connections in Figure 1(a). A serial router will always route one of these first, and will then route the others round it. If the router starts with connection A, it may produce a solution rather like Figure 1(b). It can never find the optimal solution, shown in Figure 1(c), unless by some non-serial part of its algorithm, e.g. a post-processing tool. An experienced human router would instantly find the solution of Figure 1(c) by seeing the problem as a whole.

Serial routers also suffer from problems of lack of symmetry. A router is said to be "symmetric" if and only if the results it produces are independent of the order in which the connections are considered. This order typically depends on the order they were read in from a file or are stored in memory, or some other order irrelevant to the problem. Consequently, two regions of a routing problem which look the same on input can be solved in completely different ways.

Standard serial routers use combinations of various techniques to make themselves appear more non-serial (or "concurrent") and symmetric. On certain types of design they can show some success at this. Several passes with "rip-up-and-reroute", together with evolving costs for doing so, can equilibrate the relative importance of connections very well, and "push-aside" and other tools can also improve the symmetry.

Most routers available today put down routes while performing their processing as actual geometric objects. These objects can be pushed, or even ripped up and rerouted, by subsequent steps in the algorithm, but they still have a physical presence. Managing this geometrical data costs time and memory. Furthermore, how some connections are
5 decided can make subsequent completion of other connections impossible however they are realised. There are many cases in which it is only by taking two or more connections into account simultaneously that a solution can be found.

According to the present invention, there is provided a method of determining the
10 routing of interconnected regions of a routing problem by considering all required connections in parallel and only attempting to resolve conflicts when at least some relevant contextual information has been assembled.

The method could be such that resolving of conflicts is only attempted when all possible
15 relevant contextual information has been assembled.

A method according to the invention could comprise:-

- 20 (a) defining, for each set of regions to be connected, routing which represents a suitable manner of connecting them, respecting only those conflicts which have been explicitly registered with the set currently being considered;
- 25 (b) collating all such proposed routing and resolving any conflicts in a symmetric manner;
- (c) registering such conflicts with the sets of regions which will be required to respect them on the next pass;
- 30 (d) repeating steps (a) to (c) until a sufficient completion and quality of routing solution is attained; and

- (e) converting the routing into suitable geometric representations of routing paths in a way which takes all desired routing into account symmetrically and simultaneously.

5 The example of a method according to the invention to be described is "concurrent" in the following sense. An algorithm running on a typical computer today is never truly concurrent, because at any time the processor is dealing with one particular aspect of the design, but the method to be described delays all important routing and conflict resolution decisions until all possible relevant contextual information has been
10 assembled. This means that the routing itself is concurrent, and the strategy is similar to that which an experienced human router would go through. This leads to intuitive and elegant routing, because each path has been produced sympathetic to the requirements of all the other paths. The method is able to find the type of solution that an experienced user might come to, by considering the connections concurrently. The method to be
15 described is new because the routing algorithm itself is concurrent and, consequently, symmetric.

The present invention will now be described with reference to the accompanying drawings, in which:-

20

Figure 1(a) shows a typical routing problem and 1(b) shows a solution which a standard serial router may generate, Figure 1(c) showing the ideal solution;

Figure 2 shows steps in a routing method according to an example of the invention;

25

Figures 3(a) and 3(b) show an example of a board and polygonalisation of it; and

Figures 4 - 8 show route layouts in an example of a method according to the invention.

30 The method to be described according to the invention is a router which avoids the above described problems by dealing only with the "topology" of a route. This is the route up to "homotopy" (continuous distortion with a small neighbourhood). At any

point during the routing process, it is known with a certain "probability", or relative desirability, which obstructions the routes are currently thought to pass between, approximately where vias or other generated obstructions will be, etc., but not in detail exactly where route segments will start and end. This means that pushing and rip-up-
5 and-reroute are both unnecessary, and gives the router a huge speed advantage for the expensive routing step. Furthermore, track realisation becomes a concurrent final step, and solutions which require more than one connection to be realised at the same time (and which are therefore impossible for a serial router to find) are readily accessible.

10 The method to be described is novel and powerful from the concurrent routing of its connections and from the concurrent realisation of these topological paths into actual routing. It is also unique in its ability to calculate the relative cost, or "probability", of routing taking a different (topological) path. The idea of the entire routing problem as the probabilistic superposition of many different topological routes is unique to the
15 method.

There will now be described with reference to Figure 2 an algorithm of the example.

- 20 (i) Split space into regions. This algorithm already existed in an equispace routing tool of Zuken Limited, 1500 Aztec West, Almondsbury, Bristol BS32 4RF, UK and is a sophisticated extension of the Delaunay triangulation algorithm. In Zuken's implementation, the regions are polygons and the shared boundaries are edges. Figure 3 shows an example board and the resulting polygonalisation.
- 25 (ii) Route each connection. This step is a fine-tuned flood search algorithm, stepping from one polygon to the next, attempting to find a permissible route for each connection considered in isolation.
- 30 (iii) Consult shared boundaries. Part of the concurrency comes from each boundary's ability to examine all connections across it and 'discourage' the least promising (by making them less probable, or more expensive) if there

are too many. A shared boundary also decides the crossing order for its connections.

5 (iv) Consult regions. Regions are also consulted, allowing them to place putative vias, veto crossing tracks, and so on. They also help assemble conflict objects.

10 (v) Build conflicts. Since connections are routed independently, respecting only conflicts they have been explicitly told to respect, there is likely to be crossing routing. A conflict object holds information about a region of the board and the paths which cross there, and these are built with help from regions, shared boundaries, and the connections themselves.

15 (vi) Resolve conflicts. These conflicts are then resolved independently as far as possible. Often they cannot be resolved fully, so they are partially resolved ready for the next pass which builds lighter conflicts (which are generally easier to deal with).

20 (vii) Realise tracks. Once the homotopy classes of all connections are known, they can be converted to real conducting tracks and vias by existing Zuken tools. If the conflict resolution loop has been executed more than a fixed number of times, or if passes round this loop are no longer adding to the routing, as many tracks as possible are realised, and the algorithm ends.

25 The following is an example of a routing problem as solved by the method. For simplicity, the example consists of a small region of a single-layer design with only "2-base" (i.e. source-to-target) connections. The input is as in Figure 4, required connections being indicated by dotted lines.

30 First, each connection is given a chance to route itself ignoring all other connections. Their initial preferences are shown in Figure 5. Note that no actual track has been put

down, the lines in this figure representing only the combinatorial or topological routes the connections currently prefer.

From this representation, the regions and region boundaries help construct an
5 "intersection graph". This graph has a vertex for each connection and an edge between
two vertices if the currently preferred routes of the associated connections cross. So the
vertices are routing paths and the edges are conflicts. In Figure 5, the intersection graph
has two components. The method considers them separately. Connections 1 and 2
cross, and it is better to reroute 2 to avoid 1 than it is to reroute 1 to avoid 2. Similarly,
10 5 meets both 3 and 4, and the best rerouting is that of 3 around 5.

The results of this rerouting are shown in Figure 6. Note that connection 2 has been
diverted to clash with both 3 and 5, whereas it avoided them before. Note also that
connection 1 appears to have been pushed upwards by connection 3, but since the
15 routing is only stored topologically, no change to the data representing connection 1 is
required.

A new intersection graph is now created. This has just one non-trivial component. The
'best' resolution of this component is to reroute connection 2 to avoid connections 3 and
20 5. The result of this rerouting is shown in Figure 7. Note again that connections 1 and 2
appear to have been pushed out of the way to allow space for 3, but since the routing
paths are only stored topologically no change in data is required.

The resulting intersection graph has just one edge, and the best resolution of the
25 corresponding conflict is to reroute connection 5 around connection 4.

This completes the topological part of the algorithm. The topological routing paths are
realised concurrently into actual track objects to produce routing like that shown in
Figure 8.

Since the method involves many separate entities considered concurrently, it is particularly suited to parallel processors, either within the same computer or across a network.

CLAIMS

1. A method of determining the routing of interconnected regions of a routing problem by considering all required connections in parallel and only attempting to resolve conflicts when at least some relevant contextual information has been assembled.
5
2. A method according to claim 1, wherein resolving of conflicts is only attempted when all possible relevant contextual information has been assembled.
10
3. A method according to claim 1 or 2, comprising the steps of:-
 - (a) defining, for each set of regions to be connected, routing which represents a suitable manner of connecting them, respecting only those conflicts which have been explicitly registered with the set currently being considered;
15
 - (b) collating all such proposed routing and resolving any conflicts in a symmetric manner;
20
 - (c) registering such conflicts with the sets of regions which will be required to respect them on the next pass;
 - (d) repeating steps (a) to (c) until a sufficient completion and quality of routing solution is attained; and
25
 - (e) converting the routing into suitable geometric representations of routing paths in a way which takes all desired routing into account symmetrically and simultaneously.
30

4. A method according to claim 3, in which the regions are polygons and the shared boundaries are edges.
5. A method according to any preceding claim, wherein the interconnected regions are regions of an electrical circuit.
6. A method of determining the routing of interconnected regions substantially as herein described with reference to Figure 2 and the accompanying drawings.

ABSTRACT

A method is disclosed of determining the routing of interconnected regions of a routing problem by considering all required connections in parallel and only attempting to
5 resolve conflicts when at least some relevant contextual information has been assembled.

(Figure 2)





Figure 1

(a)



(b)




Figure 3




Figure 2

3/3

Figure 4




Figure 5





Figure 6





Figure 7





Figure 8

